61.First stage in the standardized Decisional System

Dr. Ruben Garcia Pedraza

Probabilidad Imposible: First stage in the standardized Decisional System

imposiblenever@gmail.com

61.First stage in the standardized Decisional System

The first stage in the standardised Decisional System is the database of decisions, where the standardised Modelling System files all decisions in their corresponding files. The organisation of the database of decisions must follow the virtue or principle of harmony, sharing the same organisational criteria as the rest of similar databases, such as the global matrix, the global database of rational hypotheses, and the global database of instructions.

The responsible for archiving every decision in the right file in the global database of decisions is the global Modelling System, which once has made any decision in the third stage in the global Modelling System, the global Modelling System stores the decision in the corresponding file in the database of decisions as first stage of the global Decisional System.

However, the responsible for the management of the global database of decisions is the Decisional System itself as the first stage. The contents to develop in this post regarding the first stage in the standardized Decisional System are: the organizational criteria in the global database of decisions, including the development of a unified list of decisions and the setting of logical sets according to some key variables (such as: priority, relative frequency, frequency of contradictions, sub-section, sub-factor), how the Decisional System manages the global database of decisions, and the evolution of the Decisional System, and how affects to the global database of decisions, from the coexistence period to the consolidation period.

Firstly I will develop the organization of the global database of decisions, as the first stage in the standardised Decisional System, taking as a model the organizational criteria in the global matrix as a synthesis of: 1) the subject (science, discipline, activity) criteria as an encyclopaedic sub-section system per 2) position or area, geographical criteria, organised in a sub-factoring system (as a Russian dolls system, for instance: the organization of every encyclopaedic sub-section per village, town, city, as factors themselves, included as sub-factors within their respective county or shire as a factor, in turn, sub-factor within their State or country, in turn, sub-factor within their continent, in turn, sub-factor within the planet, in turn, sub-factor in the solar system, in turn, sub-factor in our region in the

universe, which in turn could be sub-factor of who know which other and superior entity).

In synthesis, the organization of the global matrix as factual encyclopaedia of any geographical area, setting for all positions or geographical areas and all encyclopaedic sub-sections for that position or geographical area.

In the same way, the organisation in the database of decisions should be the synthesis of the encyclopaedic and geographical criteria, as a system of at least one file for every sub-section in every sub-factoring level, so every decision is archived in its corresponding file according to subject and location.

Understanding for sub-factoring level system, that one able to comprehend absolutely all positions: universe, region of the universe, black holes, nebula, stars, galaxies, asteroids, planets, continents, countries, counties or shires, cities, towns, villages, natural spaces, ending up with every single position in a coordinate system, as a Russian dolls system; and understanding for encyclopaedic sub-section system all the sub-sections in which any subject in any encyclopaedia could be sub-divided.

One difference between the database of decisions, with respect to the organisation of the global matrix and the global database of rational hypothesis, but in common with the database of instructions, is a new criterion, the priority criterion.

While the global matrix and the global database of rational hypotheses only have to keep the criteria related to the subject (encyclopaedic) and position (geographical), what in the global matrix means: for every position as a sub-factor the inclusion of all encyclopaedic sub-sections of that sub-factor; so in the global matrix every factor as subject or option is included in its corresponding encyclopaedic sub-section within its corresponding geographical sub-factoring level.

Later on, having the global database of rational hypotheses per geographical sub-factoring level, as many encyclopaedic sub-sections as sub-sections are per sub-factoring level in the global matrix, but filling the file of every sub-section per position in the global database of rational hypotheses with rational hypotheses instead of data: once the specific deduction programs have made a rational

hypothesis, the specific deduction programs file every rational hypothesis in the corresponding file in the global database of rational hypotheses, according to sub-section and sub-factoring level.

But in the database of decisions as the first stage in the global Decisional System, and the database of instructions as the first stage in the Application System, in addition to the subject and geographical criteria, it is necessary the inclusion of the priority criteria.

The priority criteria means, that in every file for every sub-section (of any subject) within every sub-factoring level (in any position or geographical area), the decisions archived in that file must be ordered according to their priority, hence having more than one new decision filed, the order to follow by the standardised Decisional System, to make rational adjustments or quick decisions, and the order to follow in the second stage to project any decision, depends on the order in which that decision has been archived according to the priority level: making any rational adjustment or quick rational check, and later making the projects, firstly in those decisions whose priority level is higher, and later the assessment and projects of all those decisions whose priority level is lower.

B**ecause the first assessment, rational adjustments or quick rational checks, can produce changes across all the database of decisions, there is a moment in which, if it is necessary to adjust or check any new decision respect to all new updates that constantly the database of decisions has, the only way to make the first assessments correctly: rational adjustments and quick rational checks; is through, simultaneously all decisions are filed in their respective files in the database, the creation of a unified list of decisions: ordering every decision on the list by: priority, relative frequency, and having some relative frequency in that case indicating also the frequency of contradiction (this last one only applicable if having before some relative frequency, otherwise it is a decision which has not got any contradiction in the past, the frequency of contradiction is zero) ; at the same time that, along with this order in the unified list of decisions by priority level, relative frequency, and frequency of contradictions, every decision is labelled with the corresponding: sub-section and sub-factoring level.**

This possible unified list of decisions, could be organised by having for every priority level all decisions belonging to that priority level, ordering the decisions within the

priority level according to their relative frequency, and having more than one decision with the same relative frequency, ordering the decisions from that one with zero frequency of contradictions as first one, to the nth one with the higher frequency of contradictions as last one.

In this way, is possible to catalogue all decisions using these variables: priority, relative frequency, frequency of contradictions if having some relative frequency, sub-section (science, discipline, activity), sub-factor (geographical location).

Every new decision in the database of decisions could be archived in the database of decisions, and simultaneously ordered in the unified list of decisions, being defined the decision according to: priority, relative frequency, frequency of contradictions, sub-section and sub-factor.

On top of the list are those decisions with the highest priority level, and at the end of the list are those decisions with the lowest priority level, and for every priority level all decisions are ordered according to the relative frequency and frequency of contradictions

The consideration of what decision has some kind of relative frequency depends on the setting of margins of error for every kind of decision. If someone regularly withdraws 500 pounds in ATM, but one day only withdraws 100 pounds, but another day 3000 pounds, the possibility of withdrawing 100 pounds could be within the margin of error admitted as a regular decision, and it can have some relative frequency in the past, but 3000 probability has not got enough relative frequency, is out of the margin of error, and it will be necessary further adjustments, especially if the money to withdraw is superior to cash available for that customer according to available data, in that case, the adjustment will end up not authorizing that decision, something really useful when someone tries to make a fraud.

But something even more important than the list itself is the possibility of setting up a complete methodology to classify all the decisions in a set system, setting discrete categories of priority, discrete categories of relative frequency, discrete categories of frequency of contradictions, categories according to sub-factor, categories according to sub-section.

The setting of categories per sub-section, much more than discrete categories, is the transformation of having more than one sub-factoring level in one common sub-section, the logical set for this sub-section, is the consideration of this subsection as a logical set to include all possible decisions related to this sub-section in any sub-factoring level.

If more than one sub-factoring level, have in common one sub-section, all the decisions related to this sub-section in every sub/factoring level, are decisions to be included in the corresponding set for that sub-section among all sub-factoring levels.

So, there are at least as many different sub-section sets as different encyclopaedic sub-sections in which the encyclopaedic knowledge could be sub-divided.

In every sub-factoring level in which there could be some factor as subject or option belonging to any possible sub-section, all the information regarding to these factors (information as: data in a global matrix, rational hypotheses in the rational truth, projects in the Decisional System, instructions in the Application System) is information to be stored in the corresponding file in that database (of: data, hypotheses, decisions, instructions).

Additionally, in the Decisional System, included in the corresponding set for that sub-section in the logical set system.

The main difference between these sets for sub-sections and the sub-sections in every sub-factoring level is the fact that while in every sub-factoring level the corresponding sub-section only stores factors as subjects or options related to that sub-section in its sub-factoring level, instead, the sub-section sets should encompass absolutely all possible decisions regarding the same sub-section across all sub-factoring levels across the database of decisions in the standardised Decisional System.

So, there must be an identical number of sub-section sets in the standardised Decisional System, as sub-sections are in the Unified Application, as a main artificial encyclopaedia.

Having the Unified Application, and the global Decisional System the same number of sub-section sets, both are within the virtue or principle or harmony, facilitating afterwards followings developments.

Regarding the distribution of sub-factoring levels in categories, every sub-factoring level is, in fact, a category itself, so there are as many sub-factoring sets as sub-factoring levels.

In this organization, by discrete categories, the same decision should be included in its corresponding: priority set, relative frequency set, set of frequency of contradictions if any, sub-factoring set, sub-section set. This will later facilitate working with all decisions in a diagram of Venn.

Working with discrete categories as a set system, is easy to prioritize always those sets with the highest priority in order to make quick rational checks, in the same way, those sets with the highest relative frequency without a high rate of contradictions in the past (crossing the set of relative frequency and the set of frequency of contradiction, analysing the resulting subset), to make quick rational checks too, and going on with all those decisions less priority and with less relative frequency or with a contradiction level superior to a critical reason, in order to make rational adjustments.

Although the last set mentioned above: a set of decisions with a higher frequency of contradictions in the past, includes decisions more likely to be eliminated on the database, if any of them have a higher priority level to be implemented, should be projected, and as long as the mathematical project is made, to make as many adjustments as necessary in those decisions whose priority level is lower than this one, or in case of contradiction of this one respect to other higher priority decisions, the adjustment of this decision to save those contradictions respect to those other higher priority decisions.

Once all the decisions have been assigned to the corresponding sets of: priority sets, relative frequency sets, frequency of contradiction sets, sub-system sets, sub-factoring sets. In order to make quick rational checks in quick decisions and rational adjustments in normal decisions, the method for the assessment, quick rational check or rational adjustment, could be as easy as comparing every decision, according to its priority level and relative frequency, with the other corresponding sets.

In that case, having organised all the decisions in a set system, and considering every decision as a mathematical expression, the quick rational check and the first rational

adjustment, have to compare the mathematical expression of every decision to assess, with the current mathematical expression in every set in which every decision is supposed to be compared.

Because not all set is going to be compared with all sets, some sets are going to be compared only with a very restricted number of sets.

As much higher is a priority set, among all the priority sets, only has to be compared with those ones with a higher priority level, in order to avoid contradictions between a decision with a high priority level and other ones with much higher or the highest priority levels. So, as lower is the priority level of any decision, the number of priority sets to be compared with this decision is larger.

The higher the priority level of any decision, the quicker the rational check to do, only comparing this decision with those with the highest level of priority. So, the decision with the highest level of priority, the quick rational check, will be as easy as to analyse if the mathematical expression behind this decision is or is not projectable.

In order to project any decision, the assessment done by the Decisional System, quick rational check for quick decisions, rational adjustment for normal decisions, in addition to studying contradictions among decisions, must make sure that the mathematical expression has all the necessary elements so as to be projected, the mathematical expression is projectable.

In those decisions with some relative frequency, the quick rational check consists basically of contrasting the relative frequency and the frequency of contradiction, if the relative frequency is sufficiently high having zero or a pretty menial frequency of contradictions (frequency of contradictions divided by relative frequency) equal or less than a critical reason, the decision is authorised.

The main difference between quick decisions and normal decisions, is the fact that quick decisions only passing a quick rational check must be projected and implemented, unless there is another new extreme priority decision, with a much higher priority level demanding adjustments in any other extreme priority decisions, or routine decisions, with lower priority level compared to this one with a much higher priority level.

Regarding routine decisions, if they are quick decisions, and they do not need to pass the seven rational adjustments, in case making any of the seven rational adjustments in any normal decision is a contradiction between a normal decision and a routine decision, if the priority level of that normal decision is higher than the priority level of that routine decision, the adjustment found must be made on the routine decision.

A routine decision only passing the quick rational check is enough, but if later on there is a contradiction between a routine decision and another normal or extreme decision, in any rational check or adjustment made on that other decision, if there is a contradiction between this one and the routine decision, the decision about what decision must be adjusted, is always the adjustment of that decision with less priority level to that other one with higher priority level.

The setting of all decisions in a set system to make quick adjustments and checks, and the inclusion of the priority criterion in the database of decisions, are the main differences between the global database of decisions with respect to the global matrix and the global database of rational hypotheses.

For instance, having organised all decisions in sets, when deciding about a decision having some frequency of contradictions in the past, according to what set of contradictions it has been stored into, low or high, is possible to determine if it is necessary only a quick rational check or rational adjustments, analysing the type of contradictions, and analysing what sets related to what sub-section, this decision is more likely to have contradictions, in order to check or adjust faster as possible all possible contradiction between this decision and any other one already gathered in that set corresponding to that sub-section in which this decision is more likely to have contradictions.

Regardless of the possibility of having all the decisions distributed in a set system, the importance of the database of decisions according to sub-section, sub-factor, priority, and the possibility to have a unified list of categories, is the fact that thanks to this methodology, archiving every decision in its corresponding file, and ordering all decision in a unified list, automatically is possible to label, according to sub-section, sub-factor, priority, any decision, in order to be later included in its respective logical sets, and having the Decisional System a record of all decision on and off along all its history, to count the relative frequency of any decision, and if any, the frequency of contradiction.

Another difference, but with respect to the database of instructions as the first stage in the Application System, is the fact that the database of instructions has two criteria more, the time criterion and the order criterion, indicating exactly the time when an instruction must be complied, in accordance with the order to follow within the range of instructions: first instruction, second instruction, third instruction, etc. The time and order criteria must not only state the order of every instruction, in terms of first, second, third, etc., but also at what time exactly every instruction should be implemented.

For that reason, in the third stage of the standardized Decisional System, when a decision is transformed into a range of instructions, simultaneously it is necessary to set of the order of every instruction (first instruction, second instruction, third instruction...), and the exact time, within a margin of error, when every instruction, according to its order, must be put into practice in the second stage in the Application System.

Having a good definition of how to organize the database of decisions, and how effective the unified list of decisions, and the distribution of all the decisions in a set system according to: priority, relative frequency, frequency of contradictions, sub-section, sub-factor: it is time to define the main duties that the standardised Decisional System has as a manager of the database of decisions.

The main tasks of the standardised Decisional System in the first stage are:

- Once a new decision is stored (by the global Modelling System) in the corresponding file in the global database of decisions, according to: sub-factor (geographical location), sub-section (subject) in that sub-factor, locating the decision within the file according to its priority level; the standardised Decisional System additionally identifies, in its historical records, the relative frequency of this decision if any, and if having, the frequency of contradictions. If it has a relative frequency, it has never had any contradiction. The frequency of contradiction is zero.

- The inclusion of the new decision in the unified list of decisions, according to priority level, relative frequency, and frequency of contradictions.

- The setting of all the logical sets according to discrete categories of: priority levels, relative frequency, frequency of contradictions, sub-sections, sub-factors.

- The quick rational check of the extreme priority decisions first, once all the extreme priority decisions have been set in the set for extreme priority decisions, making the quick rational check-in priority order: the quick rational check for the highest priority decision mainly consists of making sure that it already has all the elements necessary to be projectable (there is no variable left behind, the mathematical expression is complete), the rest of extreme priority decisions, although being extreme priority decisions, as its priority is not as high as others with a higher priority level, they must be compared with the other ones with higher priority level, adjusting always those ones with less priority to those ones with higher priority.

- The quick rational check of routine decisions, all routine decisions that have sufficient relative frequency without contradiction, or really low empirical probability of contradiction (frequency of contradictions divided by the relative frequency), if having all the elements necessary to be projectable, are authorised.

- The first rational adjustment for normal decisions, even if not being extreme priority decisions, the higher is the priority level, the less the comparisons are necessary, only comparing any decision with those decisions in its own set, and all those sets with higher priority, in addition to check that it is projectable.

- Another important thing that can make easy comparisons: quick checks or adjustments; is the possibility that, having a distribution of sub-section sets and sub-factoring sets, the possibility to study similarities and differences between all the decisions included in any sub-section set, and the similarities and differences between all the decisions included in any sub-factor set. Given a sub-section set, finding more than one similar decision, one possible adjustment, within the virtue or principle or harmony, is to adjust all similar decisions in order to be standardised. Likewise, the study of frequency, similarities and differences in decisions made per every sub-factoring level.

- If the decisional system identifies a core of similar decisions that regularly or under similar circumstances are frequently ordered, in some sub-section set or sub-factor set, checking the current decisions on the database, the unified list, and the logical settings,

it would be possible the automation process in order to automatize protocols providing the occurrence of those circumstances, in which these similar decisions are made. If Yolanda always takes the umbrella, when the probability of rain is equal to or superior than some level of probability of rain, there is a moment in which these decisions are completely automatable. If in Chile there is a location with a high frequency of earthquakes, and it is necessary to construct some facilities, automatically, those locations with the highest probability of tectonism are discarded. Automatically, the decision about where to build those facilities, having exact mathematical information about all the tectonic and climatic data from Chile, is only the automation of what position has the best mathematical probability for those facilities.

- The Decisional System, according to artificial learning, solving maths problems, Probability and Deduction, trigonometrical correlations, etc., should be responsible for the automation of some decisions given some circumstances in which these decisions have a high rate of probability. And any adjustment on any decision should be treated as a new decision, starting from the beginning, modifying the original mathematical expression associated with that decision in the database of decisions, and doing as many assessments, quick rational checks or rational adjustments, as necessary.

- There are two sources of decisions: the Modelling System making decisions upon the models, and the Decisional System making decisions upon the assessments (quick or rational adjustments) and at any time that analysing the historical records, finds decisions whose relative frequency corresponds to some kind of circumstances, able to be automatable, at any time that these circumstances happen, automatically the corresponding decision is on.

- The Decisional System, finding similar decisions in the same sub-section set, although in different sub-factors, must make sure that similar decisions are put into practice, keeping similar protocols, in accordance with the virtue or principle of harmony. Standardisation at some point means harmonisation. All processes, procedures and protocols should be standardised and harmonised to facilitate compatibility and exchangeability between processes, procedures and protocols.

- Another task for the standardised Decisional System is to keep updated the database of decisions, the unified list of decisions, and the logical sets, only keeping the database, the unified list, and logical sets, decisions still on, removing from the database, the list, and sets, all decisions off.

- The reasons for the consideration of what decisions are off and must be removed from the database, the list, and the sets, are: 1) because the decision has a full contradiction not possible to adjust, 2) because an original decision after being adjusted must be off and removed, because what is going to be on the mathematical project is the new mathematical expression with the adjustments on (so the original expression is not on any more), 3) because after passing all the assessments (quick rational checks, rational adjustments) the decision has been projected and implemented and it has been completed totally by the Application System, so as it has been finished, then is over, can be removed from the database, list, sets, in the database.

- All the removed decisions, the decisions off, must be stored in the historical records of decisions within the Decisional System, as a memory of all the decisions processed by the Decisional System, regardless of their result. So, at any time that the Decisional System has to check the relative frequency of any decision, it can find in the memory as a historical record, if any decision has been made previously, and in case of not having been successful, what contradictions it had, keeping updated the frequency of contradictions for decision.

- Regarding decisions still on, at any time that there is a change in any of them, due to any rational adjustment, the change must be made on the original decision still on the database, the list, and the logical sets, to have update the exact mathematical expression of that decision still on, although adjusted to the new circumstances, as it is being implemented after the adjustments. At the same time, as any change in any original decision supposes that the original decision, as it is not on any longer as it has been changed for another adjusted form, the original decision as decision off must be stored in the memory, as a historical record, indicating what contradiction had and how it was adjusted having as a result the new adjusted decision still on the Decisional System.

The possible changes in the: database, list, and sets; in the first stage of the standardized Decisional System, are in short: 1) when a decision turns off, due to a full contradiction, 2) a decision turns off because it has been completed by the Application System, 3) an original decision turns off after being adjusted, so the decision on is not the same as the original decision, so the decision still on is an adjusted decision, and the original decision can be considered as off, so removed and stored in the memory, 4) any decision adjusted as a result of any adjustment in any rational adjustment across the Decisional System, 5) the setting of automatic decisions which providing some regular circumstances

(analysed by the Decisional System after comparing similar decisions with some relative frequency in sub-section sets and sub-factoring sets), these decisions turn on automatically.

Provided some circumstances, in automatic decisions, the Decisional System should be able to turn on or turn off these automatic decisions, provided that these circumstances are on the mathematical project, the mathematical model, or the global matrix.

As I have explained in the post "The second stage in the specific Decisional System", in the design of the second stage of the specific Decisional System is distinguishable at least two periods: the first period when the mathematical projects are designed separately from the mathematical models, second period when the mathematical projects are designed on the mathematical models. This second period could be distributed even in two different moments, the first moment of experimentation, designing the mathematical projects on copies of the mathematical models, and once this technology is ready, the projection of all mathematical projects on the original mathematical models.

In the construction of the standardized Decisional System, due to the complexity of this third phase, which is necessary to combine decisions from all possible subjects in any location, within the spatial limits where the first model of Global Artificial Intelligence is being designed, even although having reached in the second step in the third stage in the first phase, the specific Decisional System, such level of technology as to be able the design of specific mathematical projects directly on the specific mathematical models, what is really important having achieved that, is the fact that the same process used to get this achievement, is the same process to follow in order to get the same achievement but now in something much bigger as the design of the global project on the global model in the first model of Global Artificial Intelligence.

The same procedure used to experiment with how to project specific projects on specific models, in the first phase, the same procedure now must be applicable to the first moment of experimentation in the first period of coexistence in the third phase, the standardization process, in order to standardize how to project any mathematical project from any subject in any location on the global model.

For that reason, in the first moment of experimentation in the first period of coexistence in the third phase, it is possible to distinguish at least in the standardised Decisional System three different instants.

- First instant in the construction of the standardised Decisional System in the first moment of experimentation in the first period of coexistence in the third phase of standardization in the construction of the Global Artificial Intelligence: experiments about how to make single projects, the global project, the actual project, the prediction virtual and actual projects, the evolution virtual and actual projects, separately from the mathematical models made by the global Modelling System.

- Second instant in the construction of the standardised Decisional System in the first moment of experimentation in the first period of coexistence in the third phase of standardization in the construction of the Global Artificial Intelligence: once in the previous instant is possible to make projects separately, to start the experimentation process about how to make single projects, the global project, the actual project, the prediction virtual and actual projects, the evolution virtual and actual projects, on copies of mathematical models made by the global Modelling System.

- Third instant in the construction of the standardised Decisional System in the first moment of experimentation in the first period of coexistence in the third phase of standardization in the construction of the Global Artificial Intelligence: to make single projects, the global project, the actual project, the prediction virtual and actual projects, the evolution virtual and actual projects, on the original mathematical models made by the Modelling System.

As long as the experimentation process is completed, and in the experimentation period achieved how to make projects directly on mathematical models, in the next moment of generalization, the next process is the standardization and generalization, in fact harmonization, of all those processes, procedures, and protocols, involved in the projection process, in order that, regardless of the sub-section or sub-factor of any decision, or level of priority, any decision of any priority level could be projected in any location and sub-section.

Having standardized how to make projects on models, and having the Decisional System access to the global matrix through the actual projects, at any time that the Decisional System identifies in the global matrix or the mathematical models, any recurrent circumstance connected with any recurrent decision (automatic calculation of empirical probabilities of some decisions connected with some factors in the global matrix or the global model), automatically the Decisional System, using artificial learning, should be able to manage directly the situation not waiting for any decision to be issued in the Modelling System, and automatically the Decisional System should be able to turn on that decision related to those circumstances, what is no other thing than the calculation of an empirical probability: relative frequency of that decision divided by the frequency in which this circumstances (combination of factors) has been observed in the past, if the probability is equal to or greater than a critical reason, the decision is on, is rational.

In conclusion, along with the definition of quick decisions as routine decisions and extreme priority decisions, and normal decisions as those decisions neither routine nor extreme, another type of decision is the automatic decision, as that decision designed by artificial learning directly by the standardised Decisional System, what needs the standardization and automation of all the process to create mechanically automatic decisions, which without the necessity of passing any assessment (quick check or adjustment), must be projected and put into practice mechanically.

Although the consideration that some decisions, such as routine decisions, or automatic decisions, do not need to pass the seven rational adjustments, could be interpreted as a risk for the general safety of the global project, what is important to realise is the fact that the Global Artificial Intelligence, has to be designed to process millions and millions of decisions, not for day, or hour, but for minute, second, or less.

In order to process millions and millions of decisions, not per day, or hour, but per minute, second, or less, the only solution is to avoid any funnel effect.

One method to avoid the funnel effect is through the consideration that, having checked that a routine decision has some relative frequency in the past, without contradictions, or having some contradictions, the empirical probability associated with is equal or inferior to some critical reason, or having realised the Decisional System that provided some circumstances (combination of factors) the empirical probability of some decision is really high, so as to transform this decision as an automatic decision whenever this combination of factors happen, the authorization of routine decisions as long as they

have some relative frequency with zero or insignificant level of contradictions, and the authorization of automatic decisions, is going to have as a main effect, to focus the seven rational adjustments only on those decisions, normal decisions, in which are more likely to find deeper contradictions.

Along with all the decisions analysed in this post: quick, normal, and finally automatic decisions; other types of decisions which the database of decisions should include are all those decisions related to:

- The authorization or rejection of any other Specific Artificial Intelligence, system, program, or application, for instance, the Unified Application or remaining Specific Artificial Intelligences for Artificial Research by Application or Deduction, to have access to the global matrix, the database of rational hypothesis or any other stage or step in the Global Artificial Intelligence.

- The authorisation or rejection of any improvement or enhancement as proposed by the global Learning System.

- The authorisation or rejection for the construction of new devices, programs, applications, by the Artificial Engineering, within the global Application System.

These last decisions, although not having been discussed so far in this post, belong to the Decisional System, as that system is responsible for the authorisation of absolutely all decisions in the Global Artificial System.

Due to the great number of topics in every post, what I am doing is only a selection of what themes are the most important themes to develop in order to get ready as soon as possible for the Global Artificial Intelligence. But there are many aspects which only in the experimentation process are going to have an answer. Here, in this blog, the only thing that I try to do is to build the framework.

The advancement of knowledge through Global Artificial Intelligence is likely to surpass many of our current expectations, opening doors to novel forms of understanding and logic.

The development of Global Artificial Intelligence signals a transition towards technologies and logical frameworks that extend beyond traditional human paradigms, fostering new forms of non-human reasoning and non-human operations.

Rubén García Pedraza, 9th of September of 2018, London
Reviewed 20 October 2019, Madrid

Reviewed 19 September 2023, London

Reviewed 16 May 2025, London, Leytostone

Dr. Ruben Garcia Pedraza

Probabilidad Imposible: First stage in the standardized Decisional System

imposiblenever@gmail.com